

vided for the public service by the Governor General's warrant, shows that it is a mere matter of form to call Parliament together to vote public money—that it is entirely apart and outside of any necessity. The papers laid on the Table to-day disclose the fact that these hon. gentlemen, who held yesterday that it was a gross violation of the law for Governor General's warrants to provide money for such purposes as are provided for by this Government under this warrant, are no sooner placed in a position to advise His Excellency the Governor General than they advise him to commit this violation of the law which they had condemned, and which the Act on the Statute-book shows to be altogether unjustifiable. I will remind the hon. gentleman opposite that a gentleman who has always been regarded as a very high authority in this House on questions of this kind—I mean the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), the former Finance Minister—will be found in "Hansard," of 1891, vol. 3, page 4540, to have used the following language:—

The language of the Act is quite plain and I will read it for the information of the House:

If when Parliament is not in session any accident happens to any public work or building which requires an immediate outlay for the repair thereof; or any other occasion arises when an expenditure not foreseen or provided for by Parliament is urgently and immediately required for the public good, then on report of the Minister of Finance and the Receiver General, that there is no parliamentary provision, and of the Minister having charge of the service in question that the necessity is urgent, the Governor in Council may order a special warrant to be prepared for the purpose of supplying this.

It is scarcely necessary for me to point out that the obvious meaning of this clause is, that when any occasion arises when any expenditure which cannot fairly be foreseen by the department or provided for by Parliament, is urgently and immediately required; then and then only, is it intended that such a warrant should issue. Now, Sir, I say it is an evasion of the principle intended and of the meaning of this Act, for the Government, or a department of the Government, first of all to neglect their duty, first of all to neglect to take proper precautions to inform themselves of what money would be required and to apply to Parliament; and then afterwards, to plead their own deliberate neglect of duty as an excuse for having recourse to this extraordinary provision, and obtaining use of the Governor General's warrant.

And the hon. gentleman, on the strength of that declaration, moved a resolution which concluded by saying:

That under such circumstances the issue of a Governor General's warrant for the said sums was a gross abuse of the power vested in the Governor in Council under the said Act.

Now, Sir, I want to ask the hon. gentleman what was the position in this case? Was the occasion unforeseen? Does the hon. gentleman forget that my hon. friend on my left, the late Minister of Finance (Mr.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Foster) begged and implored this House to provide for the public service—to provide even a small amount that would carry the public service on until Parliament could be summoned? But, Sir, with their eyes open, and with perfect deliberation, these hon. gentlemen, controlling at the time a small minority of this House, and abusing the position of power in which they were placed by the near expiration of the life of Parliament, refused to permit this House, although a large majority were begging and imploring them to do so, to make provision for the public service. Was it an unexpected contingency, when the hon. gentlemen, with their eyes open, and knowing what would occur when the public service could not be provided for, deliberately refused to make that provision, and then came down to the Governor General and asked him to adopt a course which they themselves have declared, and properly declared, to be a gross abuse and violation of the law, for the purpose of covering, not an unforeseen contingency, but a condition of things which they, by wilful obstruction, forced upon this House? It bodes unfavourably, Sir, for the future of Canada. It is a bad start for a new Government to commence with a gross violation of the law, with an abuse of the power they possess, with trampling under their feet the very principles which they themselves have laid down in this Parliament as fundamental principles. The hon. First Minister had occasion to speak on this subject in the city of Toronto on a recent occasion, when he denounced it as un-English, un-parliamentary and improper on the part of a Government to spend a single dollar of public money that was not voted by Parliament; and yet, Sir, the hon. gentleman, instead of adopting a course in accordance with his own declaration, first brought about the contingency by the most palpable and determined obstruction which any party were ever guilty of on the floor of this Parliament—a course which, I trust, will never be paralleled again; and then, Sir, the moment it was found to be convenient for his own purposes and the purposes of his Administration, he advised the Governor General to perform an act in violation of the statute, and one which has been correctly denounced by the hon. member for South Oxford as a gross abuse of the statute and a gross impropriety. Under these circumstances, I need not quote authorities. I have here the authority, which we all regard as a very distinguished one, of Dr. Bourinot, who says on this subject:

Special warrants may issue, when Parliament is not in session, and any expenditure not foreseen or provided for by Parliament is urgently and immediately required for the public good; and a statement of all such warrants is laid before the House, not later than the third day of the next session.

I will not detain the House further on the